

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6, 24, and 27 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 14 can be found, *inter alia*, in the unamended version of claim 6. Claims 6 and 27 have been amended to make the claims more readable.

Claim Objections

Claim 29 is objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicants assert that the objection is now moot given the amendment to claim 29. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-28 are rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ling et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,607) in view of Sampath & Kumar, VTC Conference 9/1999, Jalloul et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,040) and Holtzman (U.S. Patent No. 6,393, 257) (hereinafter Ling, Sampath, Jalloul and Holtzman). Applicants respectfully traverse.

With regard to claim 1, Applicants assert that Ling, Sampath, Jalloul and Holtzman, separately or in any proper combination, fail to disclose a look-up table such that an index into the look-up table used in retrieving a scale factor is a function of a ratio between energy components of a wireless signal as recited in claim 1. Instead, the Examiner, in discussing the combination of Ling, Sampath, Jalloul and Holtzman, argues

that Holtzman (Col. 11, lines 50-56) discloses a stored data curve (or plot) that reads on a lookup table. Applicants assert that a stored data curve is not a table. Moreover, Applicants assert that Holtzman additionally fails to teach an index into the look-up table being a function of a ratio between energy components of a wireless signal. Still further, Applicants assert that the data curve of Holtzman is not at all associated with retrieving a scale factor. Ling, Sampath, Jalloul are likewise silent as to Lookup table as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Ling, Sampath, Jalloul and Holtzman, can not disclose or suggest, separately or in any proper combination, an index into a look-up table associated with a scale factor as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious to one skilled in the art by Ling, Sampath, Jalloul and Holtzman.

With regard to independent claims 11, 17, and 24, claims 11, 17, and 24 include similar limitations to claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons stated above for claim 1.

With regard to dependent claims 1-10, 12-16, 18-23, and 25-29, Applicants assert that they are allowable at least because they depend from one of independent claims 1, 11, 17, and 24 which are allowable.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-28 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding objections and rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

In the event that any matters remain at issue in the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 668-8000 in the Northern Virginia area, for the purpose of a telephonic interview.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: 

John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000

JEC/RFS:ewd